

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 10-22 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 10, and 16 are independent.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With regard to claim 1, Examiner suggests replacing "said subscriber processing system" in line 13 and line 17 with "said subscriber data processing system" in consistent with "a subscriber data processing system" in lines 3-4.

With regard to claim 1, Examiner suggests replacing "said message from said proxy signaling server" in line 19 with "said message from said proxy signaling server to said ATM edge device" for clarity and in consistent with "a message from said proxy signaling server to an ATM edge device" in line 15.

With regard to claim 16, Examiner suggest replacing "sever" in line 12 with "server" to correct typo.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph Rejections

3. ~~Claims 10-16 and 20-22~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Certain amendments have been made to claims 10 and 16 to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections raised by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 17-19 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicant(s) : Shaobo Wang
Serial No. : 10/672,771
Filed : September 26, 2003
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney Docket No.: 3A001-002001
Client Ref. No.: GD43911/SAM


Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any charges to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 3A001-002001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/23/09



Mandy Lubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2504
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499
93373.doc